Informative

6 The work is unusually informative. It contains rich, difficult to find, and/or very useful information. Highly complex material is simplified and made accessible through very effective synthesis. The audience is left with a clear sense of empowerment and/or deeper understanding.

5 The work is highly informative. It contains rich and useful information distilled into an accessible form. The audience is left with a sense of satisfaction and understanding regarding what has been learned and/or the direction it might provide.

4 The work is informative. It contains useful information presented in an accessible form. The audience is left with the understanding necessary to proceed with further learning in the area or a sense of initial actions that might be taken.

3 The work is somewhat informative. It contains material that is somewhat superficial, OR highly complicated and hard to discern OR useful material that is not easy to use in its current form. The audience is left without a clear sense of what might be done with the information.

2 The work is not very informative. The material is superficial OR not useful in its current form. It provides little or no guidance to the audience.

1 The work is uninformative, due to incompleteness, superficiality, or inaccessibility. The audience is left with no guidance or insight.

**Justified**

6 The work is unusually well-reasoned, accurate, and substantiated. All key claims are supported by apt, thorough and compelling evidence as well as with sophisticated and sound arguments. Important alternatives are fully addressed (counter-arguments, counter-examples, data, and assumptions), as appropriate.

5 The work is well-reasoned, accurate, and well supported. Claims are supported by apt evidence and argument: errors are mostly mistakes of omission, not commission. Alternative approaches are addressed adequately, where appropriate.

4 The work is generally well-reasoned, accurate, and supported. There may be minor errors in reasoning and/or evidence but they detract minimally from the overall quality of the arguments. What weaknesses do exist result from either gaps in support or unconvincing documentation. Alternative approaches are considered, where appropriate.

3 The work contains some flaws, with errors and/or gaps in logic or evidence. The points made may or may not be important, but some important claims are made without backing. AND/OR some evidence proposed is weak or inappropriate. Alternative approaches may or may not be considered.

2 The reasoning and/or data have numerous important errors and/or gaps in logic. Many claims are merely stated, made without adequate argument and support AND/OR the arguments are supported using flawed evidence and reasoning.

1 No supported case is presented. The reasoning is illogical or not discernible, and/or data are flawed in significant ways OR key arguments and evidence are missing.

**Engaging**

6 The work engages the audience from the very beginning and throughout. This is sophisticated work. The ideas and the way they are communicated maintain the audience’s interest. There is unusual flair: The author’s voice consistently shines through, as does the author’s control over purpose and sensitivity to the audience.

5 The work engages the audience throughout. The ideas and the way they are communicated consistently maintain the audience’s interest. The author’s voice is clearly present. The work reveals good control over purpose; the language is consistently clear, complete and logical, and shows sensitivity to the audience.

4 The work generally engages the audience. Ideas and the way they are communicated generally maintain the audience’s interest. The author’s voice is present, with occasional lapses into a context-less or bland style. The work generally reveals control over purpose and sensitivity to the audience, with minor lapses.

3 The work is straightforward, communicated in a competent matter-of-fact style, but only occasionally holds the audience’s interest. The work may lack a strong and consistent author voice. There is inconsistent control of the purpose AND/OR the work is insufficiently mindful of the audience.

2 EITHER the work is communicated in a perfunctory matter-of-fact style that does not engage the audience much OR the writing reveals flashes of brilliance side by side with confusing, incomplete, or incoherent language. There is either no discernible author voice or point of view OR there is great inconsistency in the author’s voice and style. There is no general control over purpose and audience exhibited in the work.

1 The work is ineffective and/or incomplete. The language used reflects little control over the genre and the mechanics of communicating for a purpose and audience.

**Clear**

6 The communication is unusually clear. Language is sophisticated and precise. Sentence structure is varied and complex. Usage is correct. Minor errors in mechanics, if they occur, do not interfere with the fluency of the work. The work is thoroughly and logically developed, and the meaning is unambiguous. The intention of the performance is achieved through an unusual control over form and content.

5 The communication is clear. Language is apt and precise. Sentence structure is varied. Usage is correct. Minor errors in mechanics, if they do occur, do not interfere with the fluency of the work. The work is logically developed, and the meaning intended is unambiguous. The work reveals a well-thought through message or meaning, and good control over how to convey it best.

4 The communication is mostly clear. Language is apt but not always sufficiently precise. Sentence structure is varied. Minimal errors in usage, mechanics do not interfere with the fluency of the work. There are some instances of ambiguity, vagueness, or otherwise hard to discern language (especially concerning the more subtle or complex ideas). The work suggests, however, a thought-through meaning.

3 The communication is somewhat clear. Language may be inadequate, not always well-suited or up to the demands of the task. Sentence structure is mostly correct. Errors in usage and mechanics may detract somewhat from fluency and audience ability to follow. There are instances of ambiguity, vagueness, or otherwise hard-to-discern meanings. Key ideas are insufficiently developed or explained. The work is insufficient to communicate the meaning effectively AND/OR the work suggests an insufficiently worked through meaning.

2 The communication is unclear. There may be major errors in sentence structure, usage, mechanics that interfere with the fluency of the work. There are many places where intended meanings cannot be discerned. Language may be too imprecise, inappropriate, or immature to convey the intended message AND/OR the work suggests an insufficiently thought-through meaning. Key ideas are neither connected or developed.

1 The communication is difficult if not impossible to decipher. Or there is no evidence in the work of an intended or deliberate meaning.

**Persuasive**

1. The work is unusually persuasive. The arguments and evidence are compelling, and the conclusion seems inescapable. The work is extremely thorough, and ideas are presented in a highly poised and effective manner. The performance is a sensitive one, clearly mindful of purpose, audience and situation. This is highly sophisticated and polished work.

* There is unusual and obvious craftsmanship in delivery; and, by inference, in preparation.
* The presentation/rhetorical techniques used are advanced, appropriate, and wisely used.
* A strong bond is established with the audience via content and approach
* Oral presentation, if any, is poised, relaxed, and personable.
* Visuals, where used, illuminate the main points and conclusions.
* There are few, if any, performance or content errors.
* Language is advanced and precise.
* The work is thoroughly and logically developed, and the meaning is unambiguous.

1. The work is very persuasive. The arguments and evidence are sound, and the conclusions are clear and well supported. The work is thorough, and ideas are presented in a very clear and convincing manner. The performance is mindful of purpose, audience, and situation. This is polished work.

* There is craftsmanship in delivery; and, by inference, in preparation.
* The presentation/rhetorical techniques used are appropriate, and well used.
* Oral presentation, if any, is clear and relatively poised.
* Visuals, where used, illustrate the main points and conclusions.
* There are no glaring performance or content errors.
* Language is precise and appropriate.
* The work is developed, and the meaning is clear.

1. The work is persuasive. The arguments and evidence are mostly sound, with perhaps minor gaps in logic or support. The conclusions are clear and supported. Ideas are presented in a clear and mostly convincing manner. The performance is mostly mindful of purpose, audience, and situation. This is solid work.

* The performance reflects adequate preparation.
* The presentation/rhetorical techniques used are appropriate.
* Oral presentation, if any, is mostly clear.
* Visuals, where used, illustrate the main points and conclusions.
* There are few glaring performance or content errors.
* Language is appropriate.
* Meaning is mostly clear but suggests a thought-through intent.

1. The work is somewhat persuasive. The adequacy of argument and evidence is inconsistent. There may be errors or oversights in reasoning and supporting data that detract from the presentation. The work is insufficient to support the conclusions AND/OR to communicate the meaning effectively. This is acceptable work.

* The presentation/rhetorical techniques used to persuade are either limited and/or there are distracting flaws or rough spots.
* The deficiencies suggest either a lack of adequate planning or rehearsal AND/OR somewhat of a misunderstanding of purpose, audience and/or situation.
* Flaws in performance and content may detract somewhat.
* Language may be inadequate, not always well-suited or up to the demands of the task.
* There are instances of ambiguity, vagueness, or otherwise hard-to-discern meanings.
* Key ideas are insufficiently developed or explained. May be taking too much for granted as obvious to audience.
* Some of the content is not apt; it may also contain a few, relatively unimportant errors.

1. The work is only minimally persuasive. The arguments and evidence do not lead to a justified conclusion as presented OR no conclusion is apparent. There are numerous errors or gaps (of logic, of fact) in the work. The work is not polished. The result is barely acceptable.

* The techniques used to persuade are minimal or naive.
* The weaknesses suggest either a lack of adequate plannng and rehearsal AND/OR a misunderstanding of purpose, audience, and/or situation AND/OR a lack of understanding of the subject.
* The flaws in performance AND/OR content are distracting.
* The visuals, where used, are inadequate or inappropriate.
* There may be major errors that interfere with the fluency of the work.
* There are many places where intended meanings cannot be discerned.
* Language (and content) may be too imprecise, inappropriate, incorrect or immature to convey the intended message AND/OR the work suggest an insufficiently thought-through meaning.

1. The work is so unpersuasive and unpolished as to suggest either that the student does not understand the purpose of the task and how to meet those obligations AND/OR that there has been no prior planning and rehearsal. The work is filled with inaccuracies and imprecision in both content and craftsmanship.

**Creative**

6 The work is unusually creative. The ideas/materials/methods used are novel, striking, and highly effective. Important ideas/feelings are illuminated or highlighted in sophisticated ways. The creation shows great imagination, insight, style, and daring. The work has an elegant power that derives from clarity about aims and control over intended effects. The creator takes risks in form, style, and/or content.

* The problem has been imaginatively re-framed to enable a compelling and powerful solution
* Methods/approaches/techniques are used to great effect, without overkill
* “less is more” here: there is an elegant simplicity of emphasis and coherence
* Rules or conventions may have been broken to create a powerful new statement.
* Common materials/ideas have been combined in revealing and clever ways
* The audience is highly responsive to (perhaps disturbed by) the work
* The work is vivid through careful attention to telling details and deft engaging touches
* There is an exquisite blend of the explicit and implicit

5 The work is highly creative. The ideas/materials/methods used are imaginative and effective. There is attention to detail. A clear and confident voice and style are present.

* Novel approaches/moves/directions/ideas/perspectives were used to good effect
* There is an effective blend of personal style and technical knowledge
* Familiar materials and ideas have been combined in new and imaginative ways
* The work provokes a lively audience response

4 The work is creative. The ideas/materials/methods used are effective. A voice and style are present.

* Novel approaches/moves/directions/ideas/perspectives were used to good effect
* There are imaginative and personal touches scattered throughout the work
* The work keeps the audience mostly engaged
* There is a discernible and interesting effect/focus/message/style, with lapses in execution
* The work takes some risks in methods/style/content

3 The work is somewhat creative. The ideas/materials/methods used show signs of imagination and personal style.

* Familiar approaches/routines/moves were used, but with a few new twists
* There are places where ideas and techniques are borrowed whole.
* Novel ideas or approaches may be present but they seem stuck on, excessive, out of place and/or not integrated effectively in the work
* Time-tested recipes and cliches are used even where there is a personal voice – the work is pretty “safe”
* The work is a mish-mash of interesting and familiar approaches and effects, but with no coherence OR the work is technically very competent and coherent, without much spark or insight

1. The work is not very creative. The approach is trite and the ideas cliched, leading to a flat and predictable performance. There is little sense of the creator’s touch, voice, or style here.

* The work offers little in the way of new approaches/methods/ideas
* There is little sign of personal voice, touch, or style
* The work suggests that the creator confuses “creative” and “risk-taking” with “shocking in a juvenile way”
* There is excessive and incoherent use of different materials, techniques, ideas
* The creator may have confused great care and precision with creativity – the work is more polished than imaginative or revealing

1 The work is uncreative.

* The performance re-creates someone else’s performance or relies exclusively on the models/algorithms/moves/recipes/templates/directions/materials provided.
* The work is predictable throughout, relying almost exclusively on hackneyed approaches; there is no apparent personal touch
* The work is timid and lacking in vivid feelings and ideas – so abstract that it has little to say to an audience
* The work is done with care but without direction or insight

**Collaborative**

1. The work was done in an unusually collaborative way. The group was highly effective in accomplishing the task by drawing upon and blending all the talents and interests of its members, by seeking agreement, and by effectively troubleshooting and compromising when needed.

* There was an explicit and appropriate division of labor that made the work unusually effective and efficient.
* Group members played to their strengths and minimized their weaknesses in dividing up the work fairly.
* Group members made needed smooth adjustments and accommodations as unexpected issues, needs, and problems arose, but their planning and cooperation made such problems minimal.

5. The work was done in a highly collaborative way. The group was effective in accomplishing the task by drawing upon and blending all the talents and interests of its members, by seeking agreement, and by effectively troubleshooting and compromising when needed.

* The division of labor that made the work effective and efficient.
* Group members played to their strengths and minimized their weaknesses in dividing up the work fairly.
* Group members made adjustments and accommodations as unexpected issues, needs, and problems arose, but their cooperation and foresight reduced such problems.

1. The work was done in a collaborative way. The group drew upon the talents and interests of its members, but may have had some difficulty completing the task and/or minor problems in efficiently and effectively addressing problems that arose.

* There was an explicit and appropriate division of labor that made the work effective and efficient.
* Group members divided up the work fairly.
* Group members made some adjustments and accommodations as unexpected group and task issues, needs, and problems arose

1. The work was done in a somewhat collaborative way. The group was somewhat ineffective in drawing upon the talents and interests of its members and the resultant work was somewhat incomplete, incoherent, and/or ineffective.

* There was some confusion or too much taken for granted in the division of labor, making the work somewhat ineffective and inefficient.
* The group did not divide up the work fairly, wisely, and/or in a consensual manner.
* Group members did not make needed adjustments and accommodations as unexpected group and task issues, needs, and problems arose

2. The work was not accomplished in a very collaborative way. The group was not effective in drawing upon the talents and interests of its members.

* There was an indadequate and/or appropriate division of labor that made the work ineffective and inefficient.
* The work was divided up unfairly and/or individuals simply did what they wished to do and not to do.
* There was little or no attempt to react as a group to needed adjustments and accommodations along the way as unexpected issues, needs, and problems arose

1. The work was not done in a collaborative way. The group never came together, dissolved into isolated sub-groups and/or individuals, or never addressed the conflicts and needs that arose.

* There was no division of labor attempted OR the division was unwise and poorly thought through.
* Group members did what each wished to do, regardless of its effect on the group or its unfairness.
* The group made no attempt to deal with problems as they arose. Individuals blamed each other and rarely themselves.

**Careful**

6 The work was done in an unusually careful way. The content and the performance show unusual precision and polish, clear indicators that the standards were fully internalized and explicitly considered in planning and rehearsing.

5 The work was done in a highly careful way. The content and the performance show precision, polish, and internalization of standards. There is clear evidence of thoughtful preparation against standards.

4 The work was done in a careful way. The performance reveals that the student was methodical and a clear attempt to meet standards, though there may be minor errors in form and/or content.

3 The work was done in a somewhat careful way. The performance is flawed, but there is evidence of methodical preparation and consideration (though not control over) standards.

2 The work was not accomplished in a very careful way. The performance is marred by serious errors, oversights, gaps, lapses, or false starts – suggesting that preparation was slapdash or minimal and/or that the student does not understand the standards and how to self-assess against them.

1 The work reveals little care or thoughtfulness. There is no evidence of advance preparation or reflection, and the carelessness suggests that no serious attempt to meet the standards was made OR that the student has no understanding of what constitutes quality work.

**SOPHISTICATED**

**6** Shows a sophisticated understanding of the subject-matter involved. The concepts, evidence, arguments, qualifications made, questions posed, and/or methods used are expertly insightful, going well beyond the grasp of the subject typically found at this level of experience. Grasps the essence of the idea or problem and applies the most powerful tools for solving it. The work shows that the student is able to make subtle distinctions, and to relate the particular challenge to more significant, complex and/or or comprehensive principles.

**5** Shows a mature understanding of the subject-matter involved. The ideas, evidence, arguments and methods used are advanced and revealing. Grasps the essence of the idea or problem and applies powerful tools to address or solve it. The student makes important distinctions and qualifications, as needed

**4** Shows a good understanding of the subject-matter involved. The concepts, evidence, arguments and methods used involve an advanced degree of difficulty and power. Frames the matter appropriately for someone at this level of experience. There may be limits to the understanding or some naivete or glibness in the response, but there are no misunderstandings in or overly-simplistic aspects to their work.

**3** Shows an adequate understanding of the issues involved. Work reveals control of knowledge, concepts, and/or methods that enable the problem(s) to be solved at the intended level of difficulty. , There is less subtlety/discrimination/ nuance than found in the more sophisticated work, and there may be evidence of some misunderstanding of key ideas. The work may yield correct answers but the approach/concepts/methods used are more simplistic than we would expect at this level of experience.

**2**  Shows a naive or limited understanding of the ideas and issues involved. Simple rules/formulae/approaches/ concepts are used where more sophisticated ones are called for and available from previous learning. Important ideas may be misunderstood or misapplied. The student's work may be adequate to address all or most aspects of the problem, but the concepts and methods used are simplistic.

**1** Shows no apparent understanding of the underlying ideas and issues involved in the problem. Brings to bear inappropriate and/or inadequate knowledge on the problem.

**0**  Insufficient evidence in the response to judge the student's knowledge of subject-matter involved in this problem. (Typically due to a failure to complete the work.)

SCIENTIFIC METHOD DEVELOPMENTAL RUBRIC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6** | Students use scientific knowledge and understanding to identify the key factors they need to consider and to make insightful predictions. They make careful observations and measure with precision, using sophisticated equipment. They make sufficient measurements and observations for the task. They display data effectively. They identify measurements and observations that do not fit the main pattern or trend shown and they work hard to separate error from interesting anomaly. They draw conclusions that are consistent with the evidence and explain them using scientific language and knowledge. |
|  |  |
| **5** | Students identify the key factors they need to consider in situations that involve only a few variables. They make predictions based on their scientific knowledge and understanding. They select appropriate equipment and use it with care. They make a series of observations or measurements with precision appropriate to the task. They try to make sense of any unexpected or odd findings. They record observations and measurements systematically and present data appropriately. They draw conclusions that are consistent with the evidence and relate these to prior scientific knowledge. |
|  |  |
| **4** | Students recognize the need for controlling variables and they know how to vary one variable while keeping others constant. They make reasonable predictions. They select suitable equipment to use and make a series of observations and measurements that are adequate for the task. They present their observations and measurements clearly. They can make simple tables/graphs and use these to point out and interpret patterns or trends in their data. They take account of these patterns when they draw conclusions, and relate their conclusions to scientific knowledge, though not always precisely or accurately. |
|  |  |
| **3** | Students respond to suggestions, put forward their own ideas and, where appropriate, make simple predictions. They make relevant observations and measure quantities, such as length or mass, using simple equipment. With some help they carry out a controlled experiment, recognizing and explaining why it is controlled. They record their observations in a variety of ways. They provide explanations for observations and, where they occur, for simple patterns in recorded measurements. They can explain what they have found out from their work. |
|  |  |
| **2** | Students respond to suggestions of how to find things out and, with help, offer their own ideas about the meaning of the results. They use simple equipment provided and make adequate observations related to their task. They compare objects, living things and events they observe. They describe their observations and record them using simple tables where it is appropriate to do so. They say whether what happened was what was expected. |
|  |  |
| **1** | Students describe simple features of objects, living things and events they observe, communicating their findings in simple ways, such as by talking about their work or through drawings or simple charts. |

**DISCUSSION**

***Excellent:***

**Discussion: Conduct**

Demonstrates respect, enthusiasm , and skill for the purpose of discussion: insight into important texts and ideas, gained through the interplay of collaborative and personal inquiry . Demonstrates in speech and manner a habitual respect for the processes and norms of reasoned discussion and shared inquiry. Effectively contributes to deepen and broaden the conversation, revealing mature habits of mind (patience, open-mindedness, tolerance, persistence, etc.).

Indicators:

* Comments and questions make clear the belief that each resource (text, video, hand-out, etc.) has something important to say, irrespective of its age, style, author, or focus.
* Asks critical questions of the text, is neither awed by nor detached from the text.
* Works to unpack and better understand difficult passages in the materials.
* Shows patience with different points of view.
* Tolerates well the inherent ambiguity and non-linear nature of discussion.
* Is tactful yet direct in dealing with apparent confusion, misunderstanding, or inappropriate behavior.
* Avoids egocentric behavior: talking too much, too long, or too fixed on one’s own ideas; avoids nit-picking, contentious debate, inappropriate language, defensive behavior, and seeking approval.
* Addresses all participants (not just the teacher), speaking directly to participants when referring to their ideas.
* Is open to new ideas as they arise (and to being wrong), as reflected in language, tone of voice, the asking of questions as often as the giving of answers, and admissions of ignorance or error.

**Discussion: Leadership**

Takes clear responsibility for the progress of the discussion or lack of it. Takes stock of the overall direction and effectiveness of the discussion, and takes helpful steps to refocus, redirect or help others reflect upon earlier conversation. Offers tactful but appropriate feedback and effective guidance to others. Takes steps to involve reticent participants and to insure that unnoticed points are attended to.

* Provides perspective: helpful summaries, reminders of lost points, clarification of perspectives and arguments when apparently needed, comments about feeling lost, connections between apparently unrelated points, returns group to key questions, etc.
* Takes initiative in bringing others into the conversation who show apparent interest in participating or who have been unheard.
* “Hears” potential insights missed by others and tries to help the speaker(s) extract them, while also encouraging discussants to attend to them better.
* Assists in bringing helpful coherence and closure to conversation through summary of points resolved and unresolved, calling for follow-up work, etc.

**Discussion: Reasoning**

Arguments are so reasonable, to the point, and substantiated with evidence from the materials as to consistently move the conversation forward and to deepen the inquiry. The analyses made are helpful in clarifying complex ideas. Criticisms made are rarely if ever personal.

* Models and encourages an appropriate degree of explicitness and rigor to the points and arguments made:
* Cites evidence from the text, and regularly asks others to do so when appropriate.
* Makes logical connections among previously discussed ideas , resolves seemingly contradictory ideas in the text or talk, and points out unexamined or tacit assumptions.
* Recognizes and avoids informal fallacies.
* Calls attention to questionable reasoning or unsupported opinions concerning key ideas or aspects of the text.
* Expresses clear and complete (accessible) thoughts.

**Discussion: Listening**

Listens unusually well. Takes active steps routinely to comprehend what is said, is consistently attentive (as reflected in comments and body language), and later writing and speaking indicates careful and perceptive listening.

* Responses indicate that the student has kept up: remarks take into account the comments of others (and prior discussions), contradictions involving different points made over time are pointed out, reminds discussants of what was said previously and by whom, writes down questions and thoughts, etc.
* Tries to understand or verify previous comments before speaking or testing ideas.
* Body language and eye contact suggest regularly keen engagement. Overcomes distractions.

**Reading**

Conduct and written work indicate student has prepared carefully, is thoroughly familiar with the materials/texts and their main ideas, can offer insightful interpretations and evaluations, is respectful of the texts while also reading them critically, and has come prepared with thoughtful questions and ideas.

* Achieves genuine insights: grasps the obscure but central facets or arguments within a text, infers the questions the author was addressing and the tacit assumptions under the author’s arguments, perceives subtle ironies, grasps the relationship of form and function, etc.
* Regularly and quickly refers members to conversation-relevant portions of text(s).
* Comments suggest a constant willingness to see the text as meaningful and worthy of study. Grasps the worth or import of the text: comments reveal an appreciation of the text’s significance and power.
* Comments and/or notes suggest text has been read mindful of prior texts and issues, and mindful of the reader’s questions and responses to what was read.
* Has read critically. Can persuasively evaluate the aptness of the assumptions, soundness, and the value of the text: can clearly state the extent to which the text “works” as a creation and whether it “works” as a response to questions, challenges or problems.
* Key questions and issues have been anticipated; key analogies, puzzles, claims, and apparent contradictions have been pondered. Key words, phrases, and passages have been identified. Has researched unknown words, ideas, facts that bear on understanding.

***Good:***

**Discussion: Conduct**

Demonstrates in speech and manner an overall respect for and understanding of the goals, means, and norms of reasoned discussion and shared inquiry. Participates in a way that routinely advances conversation and displays mature habits of mind, but may be sometimes ineffective in sharing insights, advancing inquiry, or working with others.

* Shows a respect for the texts, but may appear to struggle somewhat to find meaning or value in the more obscure or difficult texts.
* Is typically engaged in the seminar but may be occasionally inconsistent in either the degree of apparent interest or patience with others.
* Is generally open to new ideas and to exploring the lines of inquiry raised, but may sometimes stick to initial reactions or opinions without fully exploring them.

**Discussion: Leadership**

Is generally willing to take on facilitative roles and responsibilities and is helpful in the role. Either: makes regular efforts to be helpful (in moving the conversation forward and/or including others in it) but is sometimes ineffective in doing so. Or: does not typically take a leadership role but is effective when does so.

* Contributions to the seminar generally involve the offering of opinions or the asking of questions -- but sometimes with the idea of advancing personal understanding rather than collective understanding or seminar effectiveness.

**Discussion: Reasoning**

Arguments are generally reasonable, to the point, and logical. There may be some minor flaws in reasoning, evidence, or focus of remarks, but the ideas contribute to an understanding of the materials or comments made by others.

* Sometimes does not make assumptions or evidence sufficiently explicit.

**Discussion: Listening**

Listens well. Takes active steps to comprehend what is said. Generally pays attention and/or responds appropriately to ideas and questions offered by other participants.

* Concern with one’s own ideas may distract the student somewhat from full attention to other participants’ ideas.
* Generally listens with equal attentiveness and respect toward all members, with minor lapses.

**Discussion: Reading**

Conduct and written work generally indicate student has read the materials carefully, grasps the main ideas, can offer reasonable (if sometimes questionable) interpretations, and has come with good questions and reactions.

* Comments indicate student has given thought to the text but may not show appreciation of subtler points within it or give evidence of having carefully read and re-read the selection.

***Fair:***

**Discussion: Conduct**

Speech and manner suggest the student has an adequate understanding of the aim of discussion but may suffer lapses in key habits of mind such as self-discipline, patience, reasoned tone of voice, etc. May contribute, even frequently, to the conversation but be somewhat ineffective due to opinionated, unclear and/or undeveloped views.

* The participant, while perhaps generally interested and making comments intended to be helpful, may not contribute much to the progress or clarity of the discussion.
* May lose composure or patience when the seminar is not working or meeting his/her interests at the moment.
* May make comments that seem to close off discussion rather than open it, develop it, or extend it.
* Student may tend to insist too forcefully that his/her points made are sufficiently clear and correct, so that the speaker is unresponsive to the feedback which suggests remarks are unclear.

**Discussion: Leadership**

Takes on facilitative roles and responsibilities infrequently, inconsistently and/or ineffectively. When willingly taking on a leadership role, may forget role and resort to pushing favored opinions and ignoring would-be speakers and/or trying to close off discussion prematurely.

* Rarely offers facilitative comments or takes facilitative actions (such as encouraging reticent but willing students to speak).
* Tends to address words and eye contact to the teacher(s).

**Discussion: Reasoning**

Unsubstantiated or undeveloped opinions are offered more than sound arguments. Comments suggest the student has some difficulty in moving beyond gut reactions to more supported arguments, and/or difficulty in following the complex arguments of others (as reflected in questions asked and/or non sequiturs).

* Tends not to support claims with references to the text or request such support from others.
* Comments seem to be non sequiturs, not always logical with the conversation.
* May make *ad hominem* statements to the author or to other participants.
* May make contentious or hostile remarks – takes everything too personally; lacks critical perspective

**Discussion: Listening**

Does not regularly listen very well and/or is not always attentive, as reflected in comments that reflect a failure to have heard what was said earlier as well as in body language.

* Inconsistent in attentiveness, as reflected in body language.
* Appears to listen primarily when the topics are the listener’s comments or interests.
* May listen more to the more respected members of the seminar than the less respected members.
* Does not regularly open the text (either to follow references made in the seminar or to pursue a thought about the text on one’s own.) Takes few if any notes during the seminar.

**Discussion: Reading**

Comments/writings indicate that the student has misunderstood the text and/or not put enough disciplined and focused effort into preparing for the discussion.

* Appears to have read the text in a once-over-lightly and/or passive way: the text is not marked with symbols, meaningful notes or questions (or notebook is sketchy or empty or yellow highlighter is used indiscriminately); comments and questions reflect an attempt to understand the gist of the argument and issues, etc.
* Key concepts and passages may have been ignored or misunderstood.
* Little evidence of serious reflection about the reading and its topics prior to arriving for class.
* Comments suggest that the reader has formed a quick and rigid opinion and is not open to (re-)reading and rethinking.

***Unsatisfactory:***

**Discussion: Conduct**

Speech and manner display little respect for or understanding of the discussion process. Student do not display key habits of mind: they are routinely argumentative, off topic, obstinate OR student is disengaged -- extremely reluctant to participate, even when called upon.

* Behavior suggests student thinks the purpose in speaking is to score points, impress others; as if class discussion is pointless (the student wishes the teacher would simply provide “the” answer).
* Arrives obviously unprepared -- perhaps even without the needed text or materials.

**Discussion: Leadership**

Plays no active facilitation role of any kind OR actions are consistently counter-productive in that role.

**Discussion: Reasoning**

* Comments suggest student has great difficulty with analytical requirements of seminar. Remarks seem to be off the point and/or so illogical or without substantiation so that others do not easily follow.
* Student may resort to personal attacks on text authors as well as participants.

**Discussion: Listening**

Does not listen adequately, as reflected in later questions or comments (e.g. non sequiturs and repetition of earlier points as if they hadn’t been spoken) and/or body language very suggestive of inattentiveness.

* Remarks may display misinterpretations of questions under discussion and/or inattentiveness to the comments made by other participants.

**Discussion: Reading**

Student is EITHER generally unable to make adequate meaning of text OR has generally come to class unprepared.

* There are no signs that the text has been carefully read, annotated, considered etc.
* Important words, phrases, or ideas in the text are unfamiliar.
* No apparent attempt has been made to get help with a text beyond the student’s ability.
* Comments suggest student was not engaged with text and believes it to have nothing to say.

Rubric for Math and Science Problems

**6 Exemplary Response:** Gives a complete response with an clear, thorough, and elegant framing and solving of the problem; answer is insightful, perhaps alluding to more general/powerful implied mathematical ideas; includes a clear and illuminating diagram; communicates effectively to identified audience; shows in-depth understanding and control of the underlying mathematics; identifies all the important elements of the problem; may include examples and counter-examples; presents strong supporting arguments, and communicates findings with accuracy and clarity.

**5 Competent Response:**  Gives a complete response with clear and grade-appropriate methods and explanations; includes an appropriate diagram; communicates effectively to the identified audience; shows understanding and control over the key ideas and procedures; identifies most important elements of the problem.

**4 Minor Flaws But Satisfactory:**  Completes the problem satisfactorily, but the explanation may be unclear, incomplete in minor ways, or confused; argument and/or evidence may be incomplete; diagram may be inappropriate or unclear; understands the underlying mathematical ideas, but may have errors in calculations or formulae.

**3 Serious Flaws but Nearly Satisfactory:** Begins the problem appropriately but may fail to complete task or may omit significant parts of the problem; may fail to show full understanding of relevant ideas and procedures; may make major computational errors; may misuse or fail to use basic mathematical terms; response may reflect an inappropriate or immature strategy for solving the problem.

**2 Begins, but Fails to Complete Problem:**  Explanation is not understandable; diagram may be unclear; shows no understanding of the problem situation; may make major computational errors.

**1 Unable to Begin Effectively:** Response/methods used do not reflect the problem; drawings misrepresent the problem situation; fails to indicate which information is appropriate or to supply key data.

**0 No Attempt/Not scorable**

**Prompted ESSAY**

**6** The response exhibits a strong command of the essay. There is a powerful and personal voice. The writing is focused and has a fluent, clear progression of ideas and evenness of development. The writer provides specific, vivid, and relevant details to support ideas. The writer clearly develops all parts of the prompt and uses an appropriate and highly effective approach (i.e. tone, point of view, originality). An appropriate sense of audience exists. Sentence structure is varied and effective, and word choice demonstrates the ability to use a wide vocabulary skillfully. There is a satisfying sense of completeness. A clear persuasive tone exists where the prompt requires it.

**5** The essay has a personal voice, is focused, progresses logically, and exhibits a command of the essay genre. The writing is fluent, with no break in development. The writer uses specific and relevant details. A few minor flaws in coherence may be present. The writer addresses all aspects of the prompt and uses effective vocabulary and sentence structure. An appropriate sense of audience exists. There is a sense of overall completeness. A persuasive tone exists where the prompt requires it.

**4** The essay is focused and clear. Ideas and events unfold naturally, although minor lapses in focus and progression may be present. The papers have elaboration and support via specific (if not always vivid and appropriate) details. Papers scored “4” have an organizational pattern, but minor flaws may exist in logical development, coherence, and thoroughness. The writer clearly addresses the topic and supports it, although some aspect of the prompt may be missing. A sense of audience and persuasive tone must exist if the prompt requires it.

**3** The essay is adequate to the prompt, but with little voice or style. The paper exhibits some progression of ideas and events and provides some elaboration and support. The elaboration may be flawed, but it has relevance to the requirements of the prompt. Papers scored “3” generally have a recognizable organization, but contain flaws or gaps in logic and/or development. Although these papers are focused on the prompt, some may not address all aspects of the prompt. Some papers may tend to offer interesting but unconnected opinions, while other may have a list-like quality. There are details, but they may not be vivid or helpful enough to make a point. In some responses, a sense of audience and persuasive tone may exist.

**2** There is evidence in the essay that the writer has responded to the prompt, although the response may be unclear. Some essays may have little or no sense of connection between a controlling idea and supporting details relevant to development. Other responses may have a focus but lose it. Some “2” responses may be extended lists or unconnected (though interesting) observations. The essay has some sense of organization, but the writing may be too sparse for a higher score point. Some of the papers fail to address key aspects of the prompt.

**1** There is evidence that the writer has attempted to respond to the prompt. However, the response may not sustain focus on the topic or it may not maintain a constant clear and developed position. The writer may attempt to develop and support ideas, but there may be no sense of strategy or control. Many responses exhibit a logical plan but may be too sparse to be scored higher than a “1.” Some responses may lack coherence and/or may have an inappropriate strategy (i.e. pure summary, pure list).

**0** Non-Scorable:the response is off topic, unreadable, unfinished, or blank.

**Mathematical/Scientific Insight**

**5** Shows a sophisticated understanding of the underlying ideas involved. The concepts, formulae, techniques, and/or tools used go beyond the uses typically found at this level of experience. Grasps the essence of the problem: applies apt and powerful tools to solving it. The work shows that the student is able to move from the particulars and generalize to models and principles.

**4** Shows a thorough understanding of the underlying ideas involved. The concepts, formulae, techniques, and tools that are used are appropriate and adequate for solving the problem. Grasps the essence of the problem and applies apt tools to solving it.

**3**  Shows an adequate understanding of the underlying ideas involved. Work reveals control over appropriate algorithms, formulae, concepts, etc. but has some difficulty in seeing beyond the particulars of the problem to more powerful and inclusive models, formulae, or generalizations. There may be gaps or an absence of some needed concepts, formulae, algorithms that are necessary for solving the problem, but they should be minor.

**2**  Shows a limited understanding of the underlying ideas involved. General principles or underlying formulae are infrequently or incorrectly used. The student's work may be adequate to solve the problem but typically relies on crude inductive and observational strategies or needlessly laborious trial and error approaches.

**1** Shows no understanding of the underlying ideas involved in the problem. Little or no use is made of appropriate general principles, formulae, algorithms, or available resources to help with their deficiency.

**0** Insufficient evidence in the response to judge the student's knowledge of the mathematics involved in this problem. (Typically due to a failure to complete the problem.)

**Mathematical /Scientific Reasoning**

**5**  Develops a methodical, powerful, and thorough plan for solving the problem. The approach and answers are explicitly detailed and reasonable throughout (whether or not the knowledge used is sophisticated or accurate). The student justifies all claims with compelling evidence and argument: counter‑arguments, questionable data, and implicit premises are explored.

**4**  Develops fully a methodical plan for solving the problem. The approach taken is appropriate, well‑thought out, and based on reasonable data and strategies. The student provides evidence and argument for most claims, and the quality of the argument is high. All important reasoning is explicit and logical, though the student may not have considered one or two implicit variables or premises. Even when there is limited mathematical knowledge and a failure to come up with the right answer by the preferred methods, all the answers and methods are reasonable.

**3**  Grasps the problem adequately and develops an acceptable plan for solving it. All important variables have been considered, though the arguments may be incomplete. The problem‑solving plan may be inefficient: work shows some evidence that the student had difficulty devising an appropriate strategy: the final write‑up of the data and analysis may have gaps or illogical organizations of steps. Some answers or strategies along the way may not be reasonable ones, but the work provides evidence that the student was able to recognize questionable answers and re‑think the reasoning.

**2**  Provides a barely adequate plan for solving the problem, and/or fails to consider certain critical aspects of the problem in the overall strategy. Even when work is thorough, the answers and strategies along the way may not be reasonable or sound, suggesting that the student is "number crunching" with limited understanding of the meaning of the results and the logic of proving a point. There is a semblance of sequential steps and organization of data into a meaningful result, but no clear overall strategy or logic of working out an approach based on the needs of the problem.

**1**  The student has failed to come up with any clear, appropriate, and/or reasonable strategy for solving the problem. There is a semblance of proof or logic only: randomness or inappropriate step after step characterize the work provided. These papers never get much beyond random calculations, hunches, and/or drawings and notes.

**Math/Science: Effectiveness of Solution**

**5**  The solution to the problem is effective and inventive. The essential details of the problem and the real‑world context are fully addressed. The work reveals a clear understanding of how the "ideal" mathematical /scientific results may or may not be the most appropriate in the context of this problem: the needed adjustments to real‑world variables have been carefully made and fully explored. The solution is creative in many possible ways: an unorthodox approach, the thoughtful juggling of conflicting variables, the bringing in of mathematics and science in ways not likely seen as helpful or appropriate here by most students, etc.

**4**  The solution to the problem is effective. The details of the problem and the real‑world context are clearly addressed. The work reveals a clear understanding of how the "ideal" answer may or may not be the most apt in the context of this problem. Most, if not all ,of the real‑world variables and implicit premises have been carefully and fully explored.

**3**  The solution to the problem is not fully effective. Some important assumptions and facts have not been considered in the solution and methods. EITHER the work does not reveal a clear understanding of how the “ideal” answer relates to the practical aspects and constraints of this context (the more obvious real-­world variables are considered, but some implied variables are not addressed); OR the solution is ineffective as a result of the facts and principles involved not being used or understood. (An inventive but ineffective response should be given a “3”.)

**2**  The solution to the problem is ineffective, due to weak conceptual understanding of the problem and solution paths available and/or weakness in relating theory to practice (e.g. the student can only provide rote textbook answers to a problem demanding contextual application).

**1**  The solution to the problem is incomplete and ineffective.

**Math/Science: Accuracy of Written Work**

(Note that missing formulae or reasoning are not scored here; they are scored in

"mathematical knowledge" and "mathematical reasoning".)

**5** The work is accurate throughout. All calculations are correct, provided to the proper degree of precision/measurement error, and properly labeled.

**4**  The work is mostly accurate and complete. All important calculations are correct and provided to the proper degree of precision; what mistakes are made are few and related to minor calculations. The student's work is clearly shown and able to be understood.

**3** The work is accurate. Most important calculations are correct, but some are incorrect/imprecise. The work may be somewhat difficult to follow, as presented, or the work is very messy even if it can be followed.

**2** The work has inaccuracies throughout.

**1**  The work is marred by repeated inaccuracies.

**Quality of Presentation**

**5**  The student's performance is very persuasive and unusually well-presented. The essence of the research and/or the problems to be solved are summed up in a highly engaging and efficient manner, mindful of the audience, context, and the purpose of the presentation. There is obvious craftsmanship in the final product(s): effective use is made of supporting material (visuals, models, overheads, video, etc.) and of team members (where appropriate). The audience is confident that the presenter understands what he/she is talking about and understands the listeners' interests.

**4** The student's performance is persuasive and well presented. The essence of the research and the problems to be solved are summed up in a clear manner, mindful of the audience, context, and purpose of the presentation. The products are thorough and clear, if lacking in some elegance or neatness. EITHER the use of supporting material was only somewhat effective OR the students made no use of helpful supporting material available to them to make it effective. The presenter appears to understand what he/she is talking about.

**3**  The student's performance and/or presentation is somewhat persuasive and polished. The research and solutions are summed up, but typically in a chronological fashion (‘then we did this’) or without any clear sense of what would be of most importance to highlight in the presentation for the listener. The presentation is not very engaging even if it covers all the important points. The presenter does not appear to understand the listeners' main interests.

**2**  The student's performance and/or presentation is not very persuasive. The manner of presentation is unpolished and/or the claims too unclear and illogically organized to really engage and persuade the listener. The methods of presentation used are adequate but unimaginative or ineffective in making the points.

**1**  The student's performance and/or presentation is not at all persuasive or engaging. The presentation gives little or no indication of planning and practice, and the final product looks slapdash. Or, the methods used to display or communicate the information or inappropriate. (The presentation may also be ineffective because the student has no understanding of the mathematics and/or science involved.)

**WRITING PORTFOLIO**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level** |  |
| **6** | • Writing has mature character and powerful impact, achieving striking effects in all genres. Papers are polished and engaging, with hardly any distracting mistakes.  • The work is well-developed and clear, with control of each genre as well as of diverse purposes and audiences. Writing is rarely formulaic or predictable.  • Writing reveals ability to organize complex or subtle subject matter or narrative ideas clearly and effectively. Intellectual risks are taken in subject matter and writing style.  • Writing reveals an assured, selective, and appropriate use of a wide range of grammatical constructions, vocabulary, and writing techniques. A chosen style is consistently maintained.  • The work reveals a distinctive and mature personal style, an obvious control over, and comfort with polished written expression. |
| **5** | • Writing has impact: writings reveal a consistent ability to inform, persuade, describe carefully rather than tell, reveal astute observations about people, etc.  • Effective samples exist in all key genres, written at appropriate length, with a clear sense of purpose and audience.  • There are well-structured, well-developed and fluid pieces of writing, some of which handle more demanding narratives or subject-matter, e.g. going beyond first-hand experience, describing complex theories or events, etc.  • Writing reveals an assured and deliberate use of a wide range of syntax, vocabulary, and sophisticated techniques (such as irony) in addition to control over Standard English. |
| **4** | • Writing is polished, revealing control of key genres of writing, showing consistent ability to present subject matter effectively and differently for various specified audiences.  • Writing reveals good use of literary stylistic features, such as alteration of word order for emphasis or the deliberate repetition of words or sentence patterns. Student is taking risks beyond formulaic approaches to form and content.  • Writing is in standard English (except in contexts where non-standard forms are appropriate), and shows an increasing differentiation between speech and writing.  • Some writing shows polish and consistent control of Standard English. |
| **3** | • Polished writing samples exist in a variety of genres and are often effective (persuasive, imaginative, clear, etc.)  • The main features of different genres of writing are used appropriately, beginning to be adapted to different readers and purposes.  • Words and phrasings are varied and clearly chosen for interest and variety. Writing is typically formulaic, but showing signs of style.  • Writing is in standard English (except in contexts where non-standard forms are appropriate). |
| **2** | • Writing samples exist in most if not all genres.  • There are some successful attempts to structure and craft words to achieve a desired effect.  • Vocabulary and writing techniques are more varied but typically limited to formulaic approaches  • Writing reveals that the student has some control over the basic features of Standard English. |
| **1** | • Writing reveals a basic ability to present basic subject matter in a structured way, typically in brief stories, first-person accounts, or in simple descriptions.  • Stories have an opening, a setting, characters, a series of events and a resolution.  • Non-chronological writings (descriptions, directions, etc.) are written in orderly ways  • Writing reveals limited control over Standard English. |

**Quality of Proposal/Plan**

**6** The proposal is unusually imaginative, well-documented, and plausible. The research is rigorous, and supporting documentation and analysis are thorough and insightful. The conclusions and proposed solutions to the various design issues and problems are credible and creative. Complex ideas have been well thought through, through the use of sophisticated techniques/tools/concepts. The design criteria have been thoughtfully considered and effectively addressed. This is an unusually sophisticated, complete, and high-quality proposal.

**5** The proposal is sound and plausible. The ideas are well-researched, and supporting documentation and analysis are thorough. The conclusions and proposed solutions to the various design issues and problems are credible. Complex ideas have been well thought through using complex techniques. The various design criteria have been thoughtfully considered and addressed. This is a strong, complete and well-grounded proposal.

**4** The proposal is sound. The research is thorough, and adequate documentation has been provided. The conclusions and proposed solutions to the various design issues and problems are mostly credible and creative (with perhaps an imbalance one way or the other). Important ideas have been well thought through, though the techniques/tools/concepts used may not be as sophisticated as those used by the best proposals. The various design criteria have been considered and addressed. This is a thorough and interesting proposal.

**3** The proposal is adequate. The data are reasonably clear and appropriate but there may be important inadequacies or errors in the research. There may be errors or oversights in data, calculations, formulae, and/or models used that detract from the proposal. Some important issues have been thought through but not all and/or the techniques/tools/concepts used were somewhat simplistic or crude. Most of the design criteria have been considered and addressed and/or all were considered but the final proposal does not adequately address them. This is an interesting but flawed or incomplete proposal.

**2** The proposal is incomplete or flawed. The research and data are not convincing as presented, due to incompleteness, superficiality, and/or inappropriate resources. Key issues and design criteria may have been ignored or given short shrift. Techniques/tools/ concepts used may have been very simplistic. This is an inadequate proposal, even if it contains many thoughtful ideas.

1. The proposal is deficient in research, documentation, and analysis. Either the students did not understand the task, understand the research required, understand the information; and/or there was little attempt to meet the obligations of the proposal. This is an unacceptable proposal.

# Mathematical Portfolio

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6** | Shows a sophisticated understanding of numbers and how to use mathematics in context. The collected body of work shows insightful control of key concepts, evidence, proofs, qualifications made, questions posed, and/or methods. Grasps the essence of complex problems and applies the most powerful mathematical tools in solving them. Can understand particular challenges as instances of more abstract and powerful mathematical models. The work shows that the student is able to adapt models and concepts to particular and varied situations, and make subtle distinctions. |
| **5** | Shows a mature understanding of numbers and how to use mathematics in context. The concepts, evidence, arguments and methods used are appropriate for solving a variety of challenging problem(s) efficiently and effectively. Grasps the essence of the problems and applies appropriate and effective (though not necessarily the most sophisticated) tools in solving them. |
| **4** | Shows a good grade-level understanding of numbers and mathematics. The concepts, evidence, arguments and methods used are appropriate for solving the problem efficiently and effectively. Frames the problems appropriately and applies apt methods. There may be limits to their understanding or naivete in their response, but the work is on target, basic mathematical tools, concepts, and procedures are used. There are few misunderstandings or overly-simplistic approaches to problem solving in their work. |
| **3** | Shows an adequate understanding of numbers and how to use mathematics in context. Work reveals mostly control of knowledge, concepts, and/or methods that enable the problem(s) to be solved, but there may be evidence of some misunderstanding of key ideas. There is less subtlety/ discrimination/nuance than found in the more sophisticated work. The tools used may well yield correct or complete answers but the approach/concepts/methods used are more simplistic and less mature than we would expect at this level of experience. |
| **2** | Shows a basic understanding of numbers and how to use mathematics in context. Simple rules/formulae/approaches/ concepts are used. The student's work may be adequate to address all or most aspects of the problems encountered, but the concepts and methods used are limited to elementary approaches or formulaic problem-solving. |
| **1** | Shows a rudimentary understanding of numbers, basic operations, and how to use mathematics in context. The work shows limited experience in problem-framing: plug-in approaches are taken, and there is little evidence of checking the appropriateness of the method and/or answer against the nature of the problem and needed solutions in context. |
|  |  |

## Persuasive (Writing indicators added)

* The performance is unusually persuasive. The ideas and arguments are exceptionally strong and they are presented in a highly effective and clear manner. The performance is a sensitive one, clearly mindful of purpose, audience and situation. This is sophisticated work.
* The techniques used are sophisticated, appropriate, and wisely used.
* Good use is made of effective diagrams, graphs, and charts.
* Language is sophisticated and precise.
* Sentence structure is varied and complex.
* Minor errors in mechanics and spelling, if they occur, do not interfere with the fluency of the paper.
* The work is thoroughly and logically developed, and the meaning is unambiguous.
* There is obvious craftsmanship: this is a polished work.

1. The performance is very persuasive. The ideas and arguments are strong and are presented in a very effective manner. The performance is mindful of purpose, audience, and situation.

* The techniques used to persuade are apt and somewhat sophisticated.
* Good use is made of diagrams, graphs and charts.
* It is well presented, containing few, if any, performance or content errors.
* Language is apt and precise.
* Sentence structure is varied.
* Minor errors in mechanics and spelling, if they occur, do not interfere with the fluency of the paper.
* The work is logically developed, and the meaning intended is unambiguous.
* The work reveals a well-thought through message or meaning, and good control over how to convey it best.

1. The performance is persuasive. The ideas and arguments are mostly appropriate, accurate, logical, and presented clearly; errors are minor and do not detract from the presentation. The supporting material may perhaps be slightly ineffective, due to a lack of polish or thoroughness and/or due to errors in content.

* The techniques used to persuade are appropriate.
* The performance suggests that the student was generally mindful of purpose, audience, and situation.
* Language is apt but not always sufficiently precise.
* Sentence structure is varied.
* Minimal errors in mechanics or spelling do not interfere with the fluency of the paper.
* There are some instances of ambiguity, vagueness, or otherwise hard to discern meanings (especially concerning the more subtle or complex ideas).
* The work suggests, however, a thought-through meaning.

1. The performance is somewhat persuasive. The ideas and arguments are somewhat inappropriate, illogical and/or unclear. There are a few major errors or oversights in content. The supporting material is ineffective, due to a lack of polish or thoroughness and/or due to errors in content.

* The techniques used to persuade are either limited and/or there are distracting flaws or rough spots.
* The deficiencies suggest either a lack of adequate planning or rehearsal AND/OR somewhat of a misunderstanding of purpose, audience and/or situation.
* Language may be inadequate, not always well-suited or up to the demands of the task.
* Sentence structure is mostly correct.
* Errors in mechanics or spelling may have a minor effect on the fluency of the paper.
* There are major instances of ambiguity, vagueness, or otherwise hard-to-discern meanings.
* Key ideas are insufficiently developed or explained.
* The work is insufficient to communicate the meaning effectively.

1. The performance is unpersuasive. The ideas and arguments have significant weaknesses or gaps as presented. There are numerous content and rhetorical errors in the work, AND/OR the supporting evidence and resources used are inadequate and/or inappropriate.

* The techniques used to persuade are minimal or naive.
* The weaknesses suggest either a lack of adequate planning and rehearsal AND/OR a complete misunderstanding of purpose, audience, and/or situation AND/OR an inadequate understanding of the techniques and aims of persuasive performance.
* There may be major errors in sentence structure, usage, mechanics or spelling that interfere with the fluency of the paper.
* There are many places where intended meanings cannot be discerned.
* Language may be too imprecise, inappropriate, or immature to convey the intended message AND/OR the work suggests an insufficiently thought-through meaning.

1. The performance is so unpersuasive and unpolished as to suggest either that the student does not understand the purpose of the task and how to meet those obligations AND/OR that there has been no prior planning and rehearsal. The work is filled with inaccuracies and imprecision in both content and craftsmanship.

## Oral Presentation - Gr. 4

1 The student speaks clearly and the volume allows the audience to hear the presentation.  
The rate of speaking and voice quality varied in order to effectively emphasize major points and reflect the mood of the presentation.  
Eye contact with the audience was on-going throughout the presentation.  
  
   
 2 The student speaks clearly and the volume allows the audience to hear the presentation.  
The rate of speaking and voice quality varied somewhat, providing some emphasis on major points.  
Eye contact with the audience was frequent throughout the presentation.  
  
   
 3 The student generally speaks clearly and the volume allows the audience to hear the majority of the presentation.  
The rate of speaking and voice quality demonstrated little variance.  
Eye contact with the audience was minimal during the presentation.   
  
   
 4 The student’s speech was unclear and the lack of volume often interfered with the audience’s ability to her the presentation.  
All information was presented with the same rate and voice quality, indicating that all information was of the same importance.  
There was little or no eye contact with the audience during the presentation.

## Organization

1 The work is unusually well-organized rhetorically and mechanically. The logic of the development is sound and the transitions are graceful. The structure (how form and content work together) is unusually polished and well suited to the purpose.  
  
   
2 The work is well-organized mechanically and rhetorically. The logic of the development is sound and the transitions are smooth.  
  
   
3 The work is organized. The logic and development of ideas are generally sound, but with minor lapses and/or some awkwardness in the transitions.   
  
   
4 The work is generally organized. But there are weaknesses or gaps in the logic of the presentation. And/or some of the transitions between ideas are not smooth or missing.   
  
   
5 The work is not well organized. There is no clear logic to the laying out of the ideas and/or the mechanics of transitions have been poorly handled.   
  
   
6 The work is unorganized. It reads like a rough draft of distinct undeveloped and/or unconnected thoughts.

**ORAL REPORT**

4 The information is presented, rather than read, in an interesting manner. There is evidence of preparation, organization, and enthusiasm in the topic. The delivery is engaging; sentence structure is consistently correct. The speaker makes and maintains eye contact, and uses an expressive voice that can be clearly heard by the audience. Questions from the audience are clearly answered with specific and correct information, and appropriate and well-elaborated details.  
  
   
 3 The information is presented, rather than read, in an interesting manner. There is evidence of preparation, organization, and interest in the topic. The delivery is engaging and sentence structure is generally correct. Eye contact is established though may not be maintained throughout the delivery. The speaker uses an expressive voice that can be clearly heard by the audience. Questions from the audience are addressed.  
  
   
 2 The information may be read, but it is done so with clear evidence of interest in the report. There is some evidence of preparation, organization, and practice of the presentation. Eye contact is periodically made. The speaker can be heard by the audience. Questions by the audience are responded to, although the answers are not always clear or adequate.   
  
   
 1 The information is generally read word-for-word from the written document. There is little, if any, evidence of preparation, organization, or practice for the presentation. The delivery is awkward. There is little, if any, eye contact. The voice quality lacks expression and may be difficult to hear. Questions from the audience are generally not addressed.

**TEAMWORK**

**4**  The team’s approach was methodical, efficient, and effective. They carefully developed and smoothly carried out a sound plan for gathering information, assigning roles, using each other’s talents and interests, addressing the problem(s) required, and pulling all work together for the proposal. The team was unusually effective in dividing up areas of responsibility and then pulling together individual research and points of view into a coherent proposal that could be owned by all members. Each member pulled his or her weight. The attention to process and planning resulted in minimal conflicts, maximal productivity, and a fair division of labor.

**3**  The team’s approach was methodical overall, although there may have been a few avoidable inefficiencies. There was a clear and agreed-upon plan for information gathering, dividing up roles and responsibilities intelligently, and for pulling together findings and ideas. All members seemed productive as a result. Even if there were gaps or inadequacies in the plan, problems that arose en route were quickly and decisively addressed. There may have been minor inefficiencies or lapses in group effectiveness or cohesiveness, but the group effectively worked through these difficulties. In general, the team members worked well together and did their fair share, even if there were lapses in teamwork (due either to a lack of planning or of group process skills).

**2**  The team’s approach was somewhat unmethodical and inefficient. There was evidence of prior planning and division of labors, but one or both were not fully thought through, leading to a variety of process problems and wasted time en route. There may have been a failure to think through division of labors, the scope of the work, and a final plan for bringing all the individual work together to ensure a quality proposal AND/OR there were unequal efforts put forth by team members and the inequities were not addressed by the team AND/OR the team did not function smoothly and attempts to solve process problems were ineffective. The absence of planning and attention to roles and responsibilities may have led to some of these arguments and frustrations in accomplishing the task.

**1**  The team’s process was both inefficient and ineffective in accomplishing the task. They failed to develop an adequate plan and strategy for finding information and solving the problems; and/or they failed to handle maturely the group process issues that arose. One or more team members may not have done their fair share, and no adequate plan or response was made to grapple with the problem.

**ORAL REPORT**

**6** The overall presentation is highly convincing. The work is presented clearly and with poise. The facts, arguments, and conclusions provided are very persuasive. The presentation is mindful of purpose, audience and context, as reflected in the content and delivery of remarks and responses to questions, and the overall tenor of the performance. The presentation is thorough and logical without being overwhelming or incomplete. There is obvious craftsmanship and attention to detail in the prepared materials: good use is made of a polished and effective models; the visual aids contain good summary arguments and data in helpful diagrams, graphs, and charts. Language is appropriate and helpful - technical and accurate when needed, but succinct and straightforward when needed. Minor errors in delivery, grammar, spelling, etc. if they occur, do not distract. This is a sophisticated and unusually effective set of performances and products.

**5** The overall presentation is convincing. The work is presented clearly and smoothly. The supporting research is thorough and thoughtful. The key ideas, facts and arguments provided are to the point, well explained, and persuasive. Audience and purpose have been taken into account with perhaps minor lapses. The presentation is thorough and logical. There are helpful models and slides with diagrams, graphs and charts. Language is appropriate; minor errors, if they occur, do not distract. This is a polished set of performances and products.

**4** The overall presentation is effective. The work is presented in a clear and reasonably smooth way. Content and delivery suggests that the students were mindful of purpose and audience, but there may be a few lapses into views that reflect personal interests only. There may be a few gaps or inadequacies in some of the research and ideas presented, but overall the key problems have been researched and well thought-through. Supporting visuals and models are generally appropriate and useful, but with perhaps variance in style/clarity/accuracy/completeness. Language and style are appropriate but not always sufficiently precise or developed. Errors in delivery, mechanics etc. do not interfere with the overall clarity and fluency of the work but may distract in places. This is overall a well-developed and plausible account.

**3** The overall presentation is somewhat effective. The work is presented in an adequate way, but there may be awkwardness or errors in delivery and/or gaps in content that suggest a lack of preparation (and/or weaknesses in the overall research and proposal.) The audience and purpose are addressed, though there may be lapses - a focus on students’ personal interests instead of those of the audience’s and the project’s needs. There may be gaps or errors in some of the research and ideas presented; many but not all of the key issues have been researched and thought through. Models and supporting material may be appropriate but not perhaps always clear, precise, or otherwise helpful. Language in the materials may be adequate but perhaps not always well-suited or refined enough to meet the demands of the challenge. Errors in mechanics or spelling may somewhat negatively impact on the presentation. Key ideas may be insufficiently developed, justified or explained. The presentation is acceptable but not indicative of either great control over all the technical issues and arguments and/or refinement of methods of presentation.

**2** There are weaknesses in the overall presentation. The work suggests either a lack of adequate planning and rehearsal AND/OR a failure to develop an adequate complete proposal. Audience and purpose may be often ignored: the performance may be wooden, too brief, or perfunctory. There may be major errors in the prose (sentence structure, usage, mechanics or spelling) that interfere with the fluency and impact of the ideas. There may be key places where ideas are not well supported, clarified, or developed. Language may be too imprecise, inappropriate, or simplistic to convey the intended ideas. Errors in mechanics or spelling may often negatively impact the presentation. Key ideas may be insufficiently developed, justified, explained, or worked through as a team. Or, the work suggests an overall lack of care and follow-through. This is an unconvincing set of performances and products, even if done in good faith.

**1** The presentation is unpolished and ineffective. The performance suggests that either the student did not understand the task, the research required, and the information they presented; and/or no thought and preparation was given to the presentation. The performance is incomplete and unrefined and/or filled with significant inaccuracies or gaps in content. There is little or no evidence of craftsmanship and polish. This is an unacceptable performance.